Document electronically
generated from the
United Nations
Optical Disk System

1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

NPT/CONF.1995/PV.15
8 May 1995

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 15th MEETING

Held at United Nations Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 8 May 1995, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. DHANAPALA (Sri Lanka)

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION OF THE REPORT OF MAIN COMMITTEE I

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within 10 days of the date of the meeting*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the Conference in a consolidated corrigendum.

95-85399 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.25 a.m.

Introduction of the report of Main Committee I

The President: At the last plenary meeting we had agreed that Main Committee I would submit its final report to the plenary this morning. Accordingly, I should like to invite the Chairman of Main Committee I, Ambassador Isaac E. Ayewah, to present the Committee's report.

Mr. Ayewah (Nigeria), Chairman of Main Committee I: I appreciate the opportunity to present the report of Main Committee I to this historic Conference.

The report is both long and complex, owing to the fact that the subject-matter remitted to the Committee was difficult and controversial. It is also indicative of the importance that the States Parties attribute to the review process. The stakes were high in relation to the performance of the Treaty and the value that the Parties attach to it for the maintenance of international peace and security.

The atmosphere in the Committee was friendly, for the most part, even though the discussion in many areas was polarized and politically driven.

Again, the report is complex. There was no agreement on many of the key issues before the Committee, owing in part to the time available to the Committee to deal with them. Indeed, I will be supplementing this report with a note to the Chairman of the Drafting Committee wherein I will try to advise that Committee on some of the nuances in the report, particularly with respect to section 1.

Members have before them an advance copy of the English version of the report. I have been assured that the report will be available to the Conference in all languages later this week. The mandate of the Committee was clear, as is the way the Committee has organized its work.

I want to thank the two Vice-Chairmen for their invaluable assistance in this regard. In particular, I should like to thank Ambassador Richard Starr of Australia, who chaired the Working Group on Security Assurances and cooperated with Main Committee II in the joint open-ended Working Group that considered the topic of nuclear-weapon-free zones. I also want to thank the many delegations and groups of delegations that contributed working papers and conference room papers to the Committee. As can be seen, a total of 10 working papers and 27 conference room papers were presented in the Committee. This is testimony to the interest delegations attributed to its work.

I do not intend to review the report in detail; I shall refer only to the key issues. In my opinion, those issues were also the problem issues. They were: first, the definition of the degree to which all Parties to the Treaty had met or not met their obligations under articles I and II; second, the question of how to deal with certain States non-Parties to the Treaty; third, the determination of whether the nuclear arms race had ceased or was continuing in a

new form; fourth, whether the reductions in nuclear arms that had occurred in the past few years should be attributed to the implementation of the Treaty and its article VI or to other factors; fifth, the extent to which a treaty on a comprehensive test-ban and the cessation of the production of fissile material for weapons purposes would contribute to the Treaty, and the scope and timing of actions to that end; sixth, the security assurances that should be accorded to non-nuclear-weapon States Parties to the Treaty, and their nature and status under international law; seventh, the amount of progress towards general and complete disarmament, particularly in the area of conventional arms; and, eighth, agreement on a timetable, if possible, for the foregoing.

This report indicates areas in which work must be done if we are to move forward, strengthen the Treaty and the non-proliferation regime and evolve a universally accepted norm.

The task before the Drafting Committee is by no means easy. I am none the less optimistic that, with additional flexibility and a ready disposition to compromise, all of the remaining brackets can be removed. I remain available to the Chairman of the Drafting Committee to assist in any way I can, particularly in facilitating his review of the Main Committee report to which I have just referred.

Despite its many difficulties, the Committee was united about the final paragraph of section II of the report, wherein it calls for the universality of the Treaty by urging all States not Parties to the Treaty to accede to it at the earliest possible date.

In conclusion, let me express my profound gratitude to the Conference for having provided me the opportunity to serve in this capacity at this historic Review and Extension Conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

The President: May I take it that the Conference wishes to take note of the report of the Main Committee 1 which is now before us?

It was so decided.

Organization of work

The President: I should now like to report on the decision on the extension of the Treaty, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article X of the Treaty.

As participants may recall, at the last plenary meeting Canada, on behalf of 104 States parties, submitted a draft decision on the extension that is contained in document NPT/CONF.1995/L.2. Indonesia, on behalf of 11 States parties, has submitted a draft decision on the extension that is contained in document NPT/CONF.1995/L.3. Mexico submitted its revised draft resolution in document NPT/CONF.1995/L.1/Rev.1. The deadline for submission of proposals was 6 p.m. last Friday and there has been no further proposal.

It is my understanding that at this point there is no agreement among delegations for a consensus decision on any of these three proposals. In light

of this, I propose that we defer a decision on the extension for 48 hours, and during this period of deferment I shall make every effort to facilitate the achievement of general agreement, with the cooperation of all delegations. It is my intention, therefore, to report to the Conference on my efforts in this regard at the next plenary meeting, on Wednesday, 10 May, when I intend to have the decision on the extension taken, as appropriate.

May I take it that the Conference agrees with that proposal?

It was so decided.

The President: At the last plenary meeting, I suggested that I report to the Conference on the outcome of consultations on the one outstanding aspect in rule 28.3 (f).

Although good progress has been made, a final agreement has not yet been reached on this issue and further consultations are needed. I therefore propose to report to the Conference on the final outcome of the consultations at the next plenary meeting, on Wednesday, 10 May.

The meeting rose at 10.40 a.m.